

REMARKS

Claims 35-48 are pending in the current application. Claims 35-48 currently stand rejected, and claims 35 and 42 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 35-48 are respectfully requested in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Craig for his time and consideration given in the after final telephonic interview of August 5. During the interview, the parties discussed prior art to O'Sullivan, discussed further below, and potential claim amendments to overcome the current rejections to O'Sullivan. In particular, the parties discussed amendments clarifying unique actions of the graphical user interface not found in the prior art of record. The Examiner indicated that entry of such amendments would require further search and consideration, and, as such, Applicants have submitted a Request for Continued Examination and amended the claims in light of this discussion.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 35-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over publication "CPW for SIMULATE-3" by Kevin O'Sullivan contained in the "Update ..." newsletter ("O'Sullivan") in view of US Pat 5,414,809 to Hogan et al. ("Hogan"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons detailed below.

With regard to claim 35, the Examiner states that O'Sullivan teaches the "graphically populating" recited in claim 35 by disclosing drag and drop functionality for assemblies and related data between spent fuel pool and fresh fuel pool locations. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 35 has been amended to clarify that "at least

one fuel attribute” is input “into the graphical user interface” and “**the graphical user interface populat[es] the graphical loading map according to the input at least one fuel attribute.**” O’Sullivan teaches **user populating by indiscriminate dragging and dropping** of fuel bundles between locations – the graphical user interface does not itself populate or otherwise move fuel bundles, let alone based on fuel attributes. See O’Sullivan p.1, ¶ 4- p.2, ¶ 5. Without the graphical user interface actually populating a graphical loading map based on input fuel attributes, O’Sullivan does not teach or suggest all of the claimed subject matter recited in claim 35 as amended.

Hogan does not cure the disclosure and suggestion deficiencies of O’Sullivan. Specifically, Hogan teaches, and is applied by the Examiner for teaching, only a graphical loading tool. Hogan is silent with regard to how this tool may, of its own accord, discriminate based on fuel bundle attributes when populating the core. Indeed, from FIG. 9 of Hogan, it is unclear how elements may be moved between fields based on any attributes by the tool in Hogan; the figure suggests only a generic move tool.

Because O’Sullivan, alone or in combination with Hogan, fails to teach each and every element of claim 35, these references cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 35. Claims 36-41 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 35-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 42, Applicants respectfully submit that this claim has been amended similarly to claim 35, to recite that fuel attributes are input into a graphical user interface. Claim 42 is further amended to clarify that individual “**loading tools** within the graphical user interface” execute the “sorting, filtering, or moving [of] graphical fuel bundles into the graphical loading map, **based on the at**

least one fuel attribute.” Again, O’Sullivan teaches **user populating** by **indiscriminate dragging and dropping** of fuel bundles between locations – no tools within the graphical user interface sort, filter, or move fuel bundles based on input fuel attributes. See O’Sullivan p.1, ¶ 4- p.2, ¶ 5. Without the tools themselves sorting, filtering, or moving a graphical loading map based on input fuel attributes, O’Sullivan does not teach or suggest all of the claimed subject matter recited in claim 42 as amended.

Hogan does not cure the disclosure and suggestion deficiencies of O’Sullivan with regard to claim 42. Specifically, Hogan’s graphical loading tool is not responsive to input fuel bundle attributes when moving fuel bundles. Because O’Sullivan, alone or in combination with Hogan, fails to teach each and every element of claim 42, these references cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 35. Claims 43-48 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 42-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 35-48 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$120.00 extension fee herewith.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ryan Alley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By


Ryan Alley, Reg. No. 60,977

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/REA: tlt